

**REMARKS**

Claims 8-17 are pending. By this response, claims 1-7 are cancelled and claims 8-17 added. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

**Distinct Invention**

The Examiner alleges that the added claims 8-17 are directed to a distinct invention from original claims 1-7. The Examiner asserts that new claims 8-17 are directed to a system which "takes care" of telecommunications while claims 8-17 are directed "one stop billing." Applicants respectfully disagree that claim 8-17 are directed to a distinct invention from original claims 1-7.

New claims 8-17 recited features originally cited in claims 1-7. Claims 8-17 and original claims 1-7 are each directed to the same inventive concepts and embodiment contrary to the Examiner's assertion otherwise. Both independent claim 8 and original claim 1 recite similar features. Applicants submit that claim 8 further defines those features and thus may appear different from original claim 1, however, the same inventive embodiment is represented in both claim 8 and original claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the addition of claim 8 and the cancellation of original claim 1 provides a simpler means for further defining the features of independent claim 1 rather than to present the amendments directly with regard to claim 1. Applicants submit that although the scope of the claim changes by the addition or features of claim 8, does not necessarily imply that the claims are distinct inventions. As evidenced below claim 8 and claim 1 recite similar features.

Claim 8	Claim 1
Installation of one or more automatic devices and installation of a telecommunication service including one or a multi communication devices installed in the automatic device	Including the telecommunication connections needed and the use of remote monitoring of elevators...emergency telephone in the contracts between a company maintaining elevators...and client owning elevators...care of the acquisition and opening of the aforesaid telecommunication connections
Monitoring of normal automatic devices remotely using at least the telecommunication service and one or more telecommunication devices	remote monitoring of elevators and/or escalators and/or automatic doors and/or the emergency telephone
Maintaining operations of one or more automatic devices and one or more telecommunication devices	A company maintaining elevators and/or escalators and/or automatic doors...use of remote monitoring...company takes care of the telecommunication connection
Providing an invoice..	Company that takes care of the administration of the telecommunication connections, comprising the acquisition and opening of the aforesaid telecommunication as well as <u>invoicing concerning the same</u>

As illustrated above, claim 8 and original claim 1 are directed the same inventive embodiment. Although claim 8 uses some alternative language and further clarifies features originally cited in claim 1 the same features are recited in both claims.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8-17 are directed to the same embodiments originally cited in claims 1-7. Thus, examination of claim 8-17 are respectfully requested.

**New Matter**

The Examiner objects to the addition of newly added Fig. 1 and reference thereto on page 6 of the specification as adding new matter. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants note that the Examiner requested a drawing directed to the features of the claims. Applicants provided such drawing to comply therewith. The addition to the specification refers to the drawing. Each feature of the drawing and a description were originally disclosed in the specification and/or original claims. Applicants note that some terminology may vary from the drawing to the original specification and/or claims. However, the difference in terminology does not equate to new matter. The features represented are the same as originally presented in the specification and claims.

Applicants note that Fig. 1 refers to a business and client. Throughout the specification it refers to an elevator maintenance company performing services or tasks for a client. In original claim 1 and in the specification it refers to a contract between the business and client. As disclosed on pages 5, lines 9-14 and page 6, lines 25-33 reference to a client receiving and paying an invoice is disclosed. On pages 5-7 a discussion of the business (maintenance company) performing installation, monitoring and maintaining of automated devices and telecommunication services is discussed. Original claim 1 also recites features addressing each of the features of Fig. 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that the features of Fig. 1 and its description do not present new matter as each of the features represented in Fig. 1 is discussed within the specification and/or original claims. Fig. 1 describes more compactly the features originally

described in the specification and claims. However, because Fig. 1 is more concise does not mean that it adds new matter.

Therefore, in view of the above Applicants respectfully submit that Fig. 1 and its description in the specification are not new matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

### **Claims 1-7**

The Office Action objects to claims 4-7 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) the improper multiple dependent claims; claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite; claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wilson (U.S. 6,578,675) and claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hamada (U.S. 2002/0173970). These objections and rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants note that claims 1-7 have been cancelled. Accordingly, the objections and rejections to these claims is now moot.

Applicants note that although claims 1-7 have been cancelled, claims 8-17 are directed to the same embodiments. Therefore, in the Response filed on June 22, 2006 arguments with respect to the cited references Wilson and Hamada with respect to the features of the present invention as recited in claims 8-17 were provided. Applicants incorporate these arguments by reference and refer the Examiner thereto for an understanding of the novelty of the newly added claims over the cited references Wilson and Hamada.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings Reg. No. 48,917 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 26, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By   
for Michael K. Mutter  
Registration No.: 29,680  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant